

8/25/69

Dear Phil,

When you say John Foster, partner, don't smile. Nothing but evil, genuine, dedicated evil, came from him. We live with it and will, for generations, I fear. A truly bad man who made a successful career of always being wrong. What his world needed.

My interest in literature on anxiety is understanding. I want to know more than the dictionary meaning. I want to know the ways in which it can manifest itself. In short, I want to cope with it. I think I can. I'm not asking the equanimity and I feel much better.

Medicine remains as much an art as a science. I know there are some things wrong with me, but I have no reason to believe anything serious is. One cannot live as I have without abusing the strongest body. The doctors merely have not found anything. In itself, this tells me there is nothing serious.

When I recognized I was getting too weary, I started doing something about it. I lost weight, put tone in muscles, take part of each day for relaxation, etc. During cold weather I worked on the place, hard work that had to be done anyway. We have a pool and I use it. Today I was in only twice, but each time I swam until tired and then took good sunbaths while listening to the radio news. In all, I took about three hours from work today, just to relax and change the pace. And I really do not feel under pressure. I've adjusted to what others would regard as the futility of what I do - and I do it anyway. It is not futile and I do not so regard it. Only others do.

I think I am conscious of all the problems I have. I know they are more numerous than most people have. What I would like to try and do is isolate that or those most likely to have triggered this and see if I can do something about it. It is my feeling that with better understanding of what "anxiety" is I might be able to. If I can and if I can do something about it, is it not more likely that others will not do the same thing to me?

I asked our doctor for more understanding of the business and got nowhere. He obviously considers a psychiatric consultation unneeded, for he didn't arrange it (we belong to an old medical coop).

A vacation is not possible. I'm broke. Our financial situation is acutely bad. I cannot worsen it. But I also do not believe it is causative in this. It is not new and is worsening only slowly.

Is this trying to be my own shrink? I would, rather, think it is what the doctor would want of his patient, that he seek understanding and knowledge. (Incidentally, the first diagnosis, which I didn't believe, was exhaustion.) Different doctor.

Thus far I've resisted being my own lawyer when the need has been great. I hope I can avoid trying to be my own psychiatrist....Thanks for the book.

The Look piece was sloppily but effectively done. Rogers knew only what he was told and his informants didn't know their business. Example: when Ferrie went to Houston, one of the calls he made was to Marcello's motel. It is innocent and didn't involve him, but look what Rodgers could have done with it. Martens wasn't with him then, wasn't arrested....There is a kind of validity to the complaints against Garrison, I regret to say, but the story is dishonest. By intent. Garrison is serious, does believe in what he is doing and himself.

I do not know what his previous condition was, but I do believe he has over-reacted strongly. He has an infinite capacity for trusting untrustworthy people. The came close to ruining him in ways not detectable from the press. Finally learning the kind of people who were closest to him was a tremendous blow to him. I saw it. I know. In fact, I finally proved it even to his satisfaction, at some personal cost and at the cost of a worsening of our relations. Quite a story I cannot tell.

There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that Shaw perjured himself in the trial and that others did for him. If Garrison had used (perhaps, with the enormous volume, he didn't recall) what I had given him for other purposes, he would have ruined Shaw of this count, by proving the perjury while he was on the stand. I cannot say why he didn't. I was there and would not remain for the trial for, among other things, I disagreed with its doctrine. I accurately forecast what did happen and in advance pinpointed why it would. Shaw should have been acquitted. This does not mean he has to be entirely innocent. I just do not know. I have my own reasons for believing his is Clay Bertrand, which is all I ever said and believed. So, I am probably content that Garrison didn't use the evidence I had given him because had he, he might have convicted a man who might be innocent.

And there is no doubt that the trial record made in New Orleans is entirely destructive of the official fictions. That it was unoriginal is not the essential point. It is, in the crucial areas, uncontestedly accurate and proves the opposite of the Report. Sometime we can perhaps go into this. I will be adding some of it to the unpublished books from which it came. I gave this to him in advance of the trial and some of it was competently used.

So, the Look piece, regardless of whether or not some of the complaints are valid, is crooked.

I wish I could tell you more about the Ray clipping. That doesn't originate with either Ray and I do know with whom it does, a very bad man. I do not believe a word of it. This sort of thing may ruin Ray, who I believe is innocent of the murder. I think what I am now correcting, if it could get any attention, would radically alter his situation. He was framed and there was a conspiracy against him. All the lawyers involved should be disbarred and earned it, withing the meaning of those things that control such actions. It will not happen, but all earned it. That bad. And I've got it all, in black and white. (Or is that unfelicitous?)

I've rambled more than I intended. Thanks ~~xxx~~ for the help.

est,